Case	8:11-cv-00485-AG -AJW Document 383 #:8871	Filed 09/21/11 Page 1 of 5 Page ID
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	FOR THE CENTRAL D	Attorney in pro se and for Plaintiffs S DISTRICT COURT ISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, RN DIVISION
9		
10	LISA LIBERI, et al,	
11	Plaintiffs,	CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
12	VS.	8:11-cv-00485-AG (AJW)
13	VS.	PLAINTIFFS OPPOSITION TO
14	ORLY TAITZ, et al,	DEFENDANTS LAW OFFICES OF ORLY TAITZ MOTION TO
15	OKLI TATIZ, et al,	DISMISS AND AMENDED
16	Defendants.	MOTION TO DISMISS, DOCKET NO.'S 376 and 377
17		
18		Date of Hearing: October 17, 2011 Time of Hearing: 10:00 a.m. Location: Courtroom 10D
19		Location. Courtioon 10D
20	Plaintiffs, by and through their undersigned counsel, Philip J. Berg, Esquire	
21		
22	file the within Response in Opposition; Memorandum of Points and Authorities;	
23	and Declarations in Opposition to Defendant, Law Offices of Orly Taitz	
24	["L.O.O.T." or "Defendant"] Motion to Dismiss ["MTD"] Plaintiffs First	
25		
26 27	Amended Complaint ["FAC"], Docket No. ["DN"] 376 and Amended Motion to	
28		
40		
	Liberi, et al, Plaintiffs Opp. To L.O.O.T. MTD and Amended MTD 09.20.2011	

10 11

13

12

14 15

17

18

16

19

20 21

22 23

24

26

25

27

28

Dismiss ["Amended MTD"] Plaintiffs FAC, DN 377. In support hereof, Plaintiffs aver the following:

- Law Offices of Orly Taitz's [L.O.O.T.] Motion and Amended Motion to Dismiss are **not** compliant with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and/or this Court's Local Rules.
- 2. Plaintiffs are **not** willing to dismiss the Law Offices of Orly Taitz without strict proof that it is **not** a legal entity.
- 3. After Suit was originally filed, Defendant Orly Taitz filed a Motion to Dismiss stating that the Law Offices of Orly Taitz was **not** an a/k/a, that it was a law firm, which she claimed had nothing to do with this dispute. See Orly Taitz's filing of May 28, 2009, appearing as DN 35 at page 3, ¶7.
- 4. The Law Offices of Orly Taitz was sued recently by Charles Edward Lincoln, III, U.S.D.C., Central District of California, Southern Division, Case No. 8:10-cv-01573-AG (PLAx). In this case, which was dismissed without prejudice by the Plaintiff in March 2011, the attorney's representing L.O.O.T. never claimed it was **not** a legal entity. Instead, the Attorneys, who were hired by Zurich Insurance, L.O.O.T.'s insurance company, filed a Certification of Interested Parties naming the Law Offices of Orly Taitz and its Insurance Company, Zurich Insurance. See DN 10 in Case No. 8:10-cv-01573-AG (PLAx) filed December 15, 2010.

- 5. Plaintiffs have pled valid and sufficient claims against L.O.O.T, in their FAC as Cause of Action numbers "1" through "11", for which relief can be granted. Therefore, Defendant L.O.O.T.'s Motion must be denied.
- 6. L.O.O.T.'s MTD and Amended M.T.D. were filed for improper purposes, to further libel, slander, defame, harass, cyber-stalk and damage the Plaintiffs as demonstrated by Defendant Orly Taitz by and through L.O.O.T.'s website postings of L.O.O.T.'s MTD, DN 376, and postings on their Facebook pages, social networks, *Before it's News* websites, and other publications on the Internet. *See* the declarations of Lisa Liberi and Lisa Ostella.
- 7. Defendant Orly Taitz who filed the MTD and Amended MTD on behalf of L.O.O.T. did <u>not</u> support her Motions with any type of evidentiary support, Affidavit, Declaration or any type of proof whatsoever which substantiates her assertion that L.O.O.T. is <u>not</u> a legal entity.
- 8. Plaintiffs would have been willing to dismiss L.O.O.T. without prejudice with the right to re-name L.O.O.T. upon a finding it was in fact a legal entity. However, since further discovery has surfaced in Case No. 8:10-cv-01573-AG (PLAx) where L.O.O.T. was named and shown to be insured by Zurich, and with Orly Taitz's previous Motion to Dismiss filed in this Case May 28, 2009, Plaintiffs believe Defendant Orly Taitz has attempted to defraud them and this Court by now claiming L.O.O.T. is **not** a legal entity.

1

8

11 12

13

14 15 16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27 28

- 9. Taitz by and through L.O.O.T. has admitted to and substantiated Plaintiffs lawsuit against them as to the illegal obtaining of Plaintiffs private data; distribution of Plaintiffs private data; slander, libel and defamation of Plaintiffs; that they obtained the information directly from the Sankey Defendants, Reed Defendants and Defendant Intelius; cyber-stalking; harassment; and the other causes pled in Plaintiffs FAC. As a result thereof, there are not any triable issues or any facts in dispute. Therefore, Judgment by way of a Summary Judgment Motion, which Plaintiffs will be seeking Leave to file, would be properly entered against them.
- Plaintiffs Opposition is based upon their Opposition, the attached 10. Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support hereof; Declaration of Philip J. Berg, Esquire; Plaintiffs Objections and Declarations of Shirley Waddell, Philip J. Berg, Esquire, Lisa Liberi and Lisa Ostella filed concurrently herewith, upon records on file with this Court and such further oral and/or documentary evidence that may be presented at the time of the Hearing.

WHEREFORE, for the reasons stated herein, Plaintiffs respectfully request this Court to deny Defendant Law Offices of Orly Taitz Motion to Dismiss and Amended Motion to Dismiss. Plaintiffs are also Requesting this Court to Grant them Attorney Fees and Costs for Orly Taitz's frivolous filings for the improper

purpose to further harass and harm the Plaintiffs. In the alternative, Plaintiffs Request Leave to Amend their Complaint. Respectfully submitted, /s/ Philip J. Berg Dated: September 21, 2011 Philip J. Berg, Esquire Pennsylvania I.D. 9867 LAW OFFICES OF PHILIP J. BERG 555 Andorra Glen Court, Suite 12 Lafayette Hill, PA 19444-2531 Telephone: (610) 825-3134 E-mail: philiberg@gmail.com Attorney in Pro Se and Counsel for **Plaintiffs**

Case 8:11-cv-00485-AG -AJW Document 383 Filed 09/21/11 Page 5 of 5 Page ID